

No. 11286.

IN THE  
United States Circuit Court of Appeals  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

---

UNIVERSAL PICTURES COMPANY, INC., a Delaware Corporation, and CLYDE BRUCKMAN,

*Appellants,*

*vs.*

HAROLD LLOYD CORPORATION, a California corporation,

*Appellee.*

---

HAROLD LLOYD CORPORATION, a California corporation,

*Appellant,*

*vs.*

UNIVERSAL PICTURES COMPANY, INC., a Delaware Corporation, and CLYDE BRUCKMAN,

*Appellees.*

---

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR MODIFICATION  
AND ALLOWANCE OF ATTORNEYS FEES.

---

JULIAN T. ABELES,  
MITCHELL, SILBERBERG & KNUPP and  
GUY KNUPP,

603 Roosevelt Building, Los Angeles 14,  
*Attorneys for Universal Pictures Company, Inc.*

LEWINSON & ARMSTRONG and  
JOSEPH L. LEWINSON,  
1120 Pacific Finance Building, Los Angeles 14,  
*Attorneys for Clyde Bruckman.*



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE
Cain v. Universal Pictures Co., 47 F. Supp. 113.....	4
Clark v. Stumpf, 180 N. Y. Supp. 125.....	4
Cordes v. Guy Inv. Co., 262 Pac. 131.....	4
Cory v. Physical Culture Hotel, Inc., 88 F. (2d) 411.....	4
Deward Rich v. Bristol Savings and Loan Corp., 120 F. (2d) 537 .....	4
Jolly, Estate of, 101 P. (2d) 995.....	4
Matthews v. Tripp, 281 N. W. 412.....	4
Paulson v. Kenny, 224 Pac. 634.....	4
Standard Plunger Elev. Co. v. Stokes, 212 Fed. 893.....	4
Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation v. Stonsifer, 140 F. (2d) 579 .....	4

## STATUTES

Copyright Act, Sec. 40 (17 U. S. C. A., Sec. 166).....	4
--	---



No. 11286.  
IN THE  
United States Circuit Court of Appeals  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

---

UNIVERSAL PICTURES COMPANY, INC., a Delaware Corporation, and CLYDE BRUCKMAN,

*Appellants,*

*vs.*

HAROLD LLOYD CORPORATION, a California corporation,

*Appellee.*

---

HAROLD LLOYD CORPORATION, a California corporation,

*Appellant,*

*vs.*

UNIVERSAL PICTURES COMPANY, INC., a Delaware Corporation, and CLYDE BRUCKMAN,

*Appellees.*

---

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR MODIFICATION  
AND ALLOWANCE OF ATTORNEYS FEES.

---

The appellee *and appellant* Harold Lloyd Corporation, in the petition filed herein asking for modification of the opinion and judgment so as to include the fees of its attorney upon the appeal, presents the matter to the court as though there had been but a single appeal and that Harold Lloyd Corporation was before the court only as appellee. So far does the petitioner go in this respect that